



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## RECENT CASES

BAILMENT—CONTRACT—LIABILITY OF BAILEE—NIAGARA ALKALI CO. v. CHAMPION COATED PAPER CO., 146 N. Y. S. 284.—Plaintiff entered into a contract to sell defendant two years' supply of muratic acid, and agreed to ship to him 500 empty carboys to remain in defendant's possession during the life of the contract without charge, to be used for the storage of the acid; the carboys to be returned at the end of the contract and all not so returned to be paid for. The carboys, while stored in a safe place by defendant, were carried away by an unprecedented flood. *Held*, the defendant was merely bailee of the carboys, and was not liable for their loss occurring through an act of God.

Where a private carrier for hire contracted that he "would move them (the goods) with care and deliver them safely", *held*, this was not a warranty against every loss and did not enlarge his obligation beyond that of mere bailee so as to make him liable for loss other than that caused by his failure to use care and skill. *Jamiet v. American Storage Co.*, 109 Mo. App. 257. Where patterns had been delivered to bailee to make castings with an agreement to be responsible for the patterns and to safely return them, and they were destroyed by fire without the fault of the bailee, *held*, bailee is not liable in the absence of a special agreement to insure. *Caldwell-Wilcox Co. v. Sullivan*, 3 N. Y. App. Div. 359; *Young v. Leary*, 135 N. Y. 569. Plaintiff leased fire extinguishers to defendant under an agreement that if any damage were done the lessee would pay the "value of the property so damaged or destroyed" to lessor. *Held*, the lessee was liable where they were destroyed by fire though the fire did not result from his negligence. Greenbaum, J., *dissenting*. *Rapid Fire Extinguisher Co. v. Hay-Budden Mfg. Co.*, 75 N. Y. S., 1008. Where a bailee for hire said "I will take the horse and return him in as good or better condition than I took him and if I don't I will agree to pay for him", *held*, bailee was liable for the value of the horse which died on his hands, though without the fault of the bailee. *Grady v. Schwermeler*, 113 N. W. (N. D.) 1031. In contracts of bailment providing for the return of the article bailed at the end of the period of bailment, there is a conflict of authority whether the bailee becomes an insurer of the thing bailed. All authorities agree that the bailee may make such a contract of insurance. In the absence of a clear, express agreement to insure, the better view is that there is an implied condition precedent that the article bailed will be in existence at the end of the bailment period, and if it lost without the fault or negligence of the bailee, he is not liable.

DIVORCE—PROHIBITION AGAINST REMARRIAGE—WHAT LAW GOVERNS.—PEOPLE v. PROUTY, 104 N. E. (ILL.) 387.—*Held*, the divorce act effective July 1, 1905, prohibiting the remarriage of parties divorced for certain causes, and providing that a marriage in violation of the act shall be held absolutely void, governs as to the rights of the parties within this state even though the subsequent marriage be performed within another jurisdiction.